

**REMARKS**

This Amendment responds to the Office Action mailed January 22, 2004 in the above-identified application. Based on the foregoing amendments and the following comments, reconsideration and allowance of the application are respectfully requested.

Claims 1-12 are pending in the application. Claim 1 is the only independent claim. Claims 1, 7, 11 and 12 have been amended solely for clarification and not to distinguish over the prior art of record. The specification has been amended to correct minor errors. No new matter has been introduced.

Claims 11 and 12 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite because certain limitations are alleged to lack antecedent basis. Claims 11 and 12 have been amended to depend from claim 10. Claim 10 provides antecedent basis for the limitations in claims 11 and 12. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, is respectfully requested.

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-3, 5 and 7-9 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as anticipated by Noro (US 5,206,912). Claims 1, 7 and 10-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as anticipated by Pritchard (US 5,761,316). Claims 4 and 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over Noro. The rejections are respectfully traversed.

Noro discloses an adapter which is used in combination with a power amplifier to apparently change transfer characteristics of the power amplifier when a loudspeaker is driven by the power amplifier (abstract). An embodiment of the adapter shown in Fig. 6 includes differential amplifiers 31 and 32 which are respectively used for detecting the output voltage and current of the amplifier in order that they are used for feedback signals (col. 8, lines 10-13). The output of differential amplifier 31 is supplied to transfer characteristic correcting circuit 18, and the output of differential amplifier 32 is supplied to feedback amplifier 15.

Amended claim 1 is directed to a thermal overload and resonant motion control circuit for an audio speaker driven by a drive signal from an amplifier. The circuit includes a feedback signal generating circuit for generating a feedback signal and an attenuator operable in response to the feedback signal for controlling the drive signal. The feedback signal is a function of both drive current to the speaker and speaker impedance.

Noro discloses a circuit wherein differential amplifier 31 generates a first signal that represents output voltage, and differential amplifier 32 generates a second signal that represents output current. However, Noro contains no disclosure or suggestion of a feedback signal generating circuit which generates *a feedback signal which is a function of both drive current to the speaker and speaker impedance*, as required by amended claim 1. Noro discloses separate signals that represent different parameters. Furthermore, Noro contains no disclosure of an attenuator that is operable in response to such a feedback signal for controlling a drive signal, as claimed. For these reasons, amended claim 1 is clearly and patentably distinguished over Noro.

Claims 2-12 depend from claim 1 and are patentable over Noro for at least the reasons discussed above in connection with claim 1.

Pritchard discloses an audio power amplifier which emulates vacuum tube amplifiers (col. 1, lines 5-15). Fig. 1 of Pritchard shows a power amplifier circuit wherein a resistor 31 senses speaker current. Resistor 31 also emulates the saturation resistance of a tube amplifier output stage (col. 3, lines 49-52). Pritchard contains no disclosure or suggestion whatever of a feedback signal generating circuit for generating *a feedback signal which is a function of both drive current to the speaker and speaker impedance*, as required by amended claim 1. Furthermore, Pritchard contains no disclosure or suggestion of an attenuator which is operable in response to such feedback signal for controlling a drive signal, as claimed. For these reasons, amended claim 1 is clearly and patentably distinguished over Pritchard.

Claims 2-12 depend from claim 1 and are patentable over Pritchard for at least the reasons discussed above in connection with claim 1.

### CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, this application should now be in condition for allowance. A notice to this effect is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes, after this amendment, that the application is not in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to call the Applicant's attorney at the telephone number listed below.

If this response is not considered timely filed and if a request for an extension of time is otherwise absent, Applicant hereby requests any necessary extension of time. If there is a fee

Serial No.: 09/392,019  
Conf. No.: 9463

- 8 -

Art Unit: 2644

occasioned by this response, including an extension fee, that is not covered by an enclosed check, please charge any deficiency to Deposit Account No. 23/2825.

Respectfully submitted,  
*David Cahill, Applicant*

By: William R. McClellan  
William R. McClellan, Reg. No. 29,409  
Wolf, Greenfield & Sacks, P.C.  
600 Atlantic Avenue  
Boston, Massachusetts 02210-2211  
Telephone: (617) 720-3500

Docket No. B0630.70020US00  
Date: April 21, 2004  
x04/22/04x